

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies.*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs.*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act.*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants.*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program).*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs.*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities.*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2005-06 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

Tennessee's State Board of Education has adopted challenging content standards in science that are consistent with section 1111(b)(1). These standards can be found at the Department's website at

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/standards/>

Tennessee has developed Alternate Achievement Standards which are directly linked to general curriculum

content standards in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science. These Alternate Achievement Standards can be found at the Department's website at

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/speced/seassessment.shtml#DISABILITY>

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading, math and science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process).

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

The new assessment system was implemented in Spring 2004 for all content areas, reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies.

The high school test for mathematics, Gateway Math, and the high school tests for language arts, Gateway English and 11th grade writing assessment, have already been implemented. Information about those tests can be found on the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/assessment/>.

Local educational agencies are involved with the development and implementation of our assessments in the following ways:

1. they approve and revise all of our criterion-referenced items;
2. they review all criterion-referenced items for bias; and,
3. they participate in the standards setting process.

The Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) is the statewide assessment program developed for all students. The TCAP Alternate Assessment (TCAP-Alt) was developed to include students with the most significant cognitive/adaptive disabilities in the statewide assessment and accountability program. The TCAP-Alt consists of one type of assessment: the portfolio assessment (PA). The IEP Team must ensure that the student meets the TCAP-Alt Participation Guidelines prior to the student's participation in the PA. In the 2005-2006 school year, the PA option was revised to include alignment with academic content standards and assess the student's progress on alternate achievement standards for the student's grade level. Upon the deadline for submission, no bids were received. The RFP for another alternate assessment is in the process of revision and will be re-released - soon. The revision will include a plan for a new assessment based on modified achievement standards as defined by federal guidelines.

In the 2004-2005 school year, an Alternate Writing Assessment (TCAP-Alt Writing) was developed. In February, 2005, twenty-five practitioners from across the state met to set the alternate achievement standards for measurement of the TCAP Writing Assessment. Beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, students who met the TCAP-Alt Participation Guidelines were able to participate in the TCAP-Alt Writing Assessment.

The TCAP-Alt PA meet federal requirements for No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

Tennessee's assessment system has been approved for reading, math and science through ED's peer review process as of the end of SY 2005-06 (defined as June 30, 2006 for this process).

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

Tennessee set its academic achievement standards in mathematics and reading/language arts for grades 3, 5, and 8 in consultation with LEAs in July 2003. Academic achievement standards for science in consultation with LEAs was set in July 2004

Academic achievement standards for the writing assessment given in grades 5, 8, and 11 have already been set. Academic achievement standards for Gateway Math and Gateway English have also been set. The State always consults with representatives from LEAs in the setting of achievement standards.

In February, 2005, the development of Alternate Achievement Standards for Tennessee's students with the most significant cognitive/adaptive disabilities began. The committee which developed these Alternate Achievement Standards included 50 LEA representatives from across the state and the TCAP-Alt Advisory Committee. The Alternate Achievement Standards were completed in September, 2005, after a series of meetings. The TCAP-Alt Portfolio Assessment was revised in September, 2005 to include the Alternate Achievement Standards developed by the State's Alternate Achievement Committee.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	514627	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1256	99.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	7140	99.70
Black, non-Hispanic	134906	99.00
Hispanic	20543	99.30
White, non-Hispanic	349809	99.50
Students with Disabilities	64879	99.10
Limited English Proficient	9334	99.20
Economically Disadvantaged	250925	99.20
Migrant	472	98.70
Male	263557	99.30
Female	251070	99.50

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	510492	99.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1221	99.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	7326	99.60
Black, non-Hispanic	129327	99.20
Hispanic	20101	99.20
White, non-Hispanic	351596	99.50
Students with Disabilities	63417	99.00
Limited English Proficient	8979	98.90
Economically Disadvantaged	245268	99.20
Migrant	444	98.50
Male	261872	99.30
Female	248620	99.50

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	54800	49.10
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4671	4.18

Comments: Numbers reflect only first-time test takers on the 9-12 level.

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	52033	46.62
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4505	4.04

Comments: Numbers reflect only first-time test takers on the 9-12 level.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	71228	87.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	120	94.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1084	95.20
Black, non-Hispanic	17722	76.10
Hispanic	3426	80.70
White, non-Hispanic	48678	91.90
Students with Disabilities	8403	61.80
Limited English Proficient	1773	67.20
Economically Disadvantaged	36671	81.20
Migrant	67	76.10
Male	36263	87.20
Female	34746	87.90

Comments: Change in the enrollment of students.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	71064	89.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	120	94.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1071	93.00
Black, non-Hispanic	17708	80.50
Hispanic	3294	80.40
White, non-Hispanic	48673	92.70
Students with Disabilities	8403	75.80
Limited English Proficient	1610	61.70
Economically Disadvantaged	36536	83.50
Migrant	63	65.10
Male	36174	87.20
Female	34673	91.10

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	70890	87.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	127	89.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1026	96.30
Black, non-Hispanic	17545	77.20
Hispanic	3186	80.90
White, non-Hispanic	48753	91.80
Students with Disabilities	8654	59.40
Limited English Proficient	1578	68.70
Economically Disadvantaged	35780	81.10
Migrant	65	67.70
Male	36340	86.20
Female	34416	89.30

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	70743	87.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	127	88.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1007	94.70
Black, non-Hispanic	17526	78.70
Hispanic	3084	76.80
White, non-Hispanic	48745	91.90
Students with Disabilities	8652	67.20
Limited English Proficient	1439	56.20
Economically Disadvantaged	35665	81.40
Migrant	60	55.00
Male	36260	85.40
Female	34349	90.60

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	72064	92.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	135	92.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1013	97.00
Black, non-Hispanic	18067	85.10
Hispanic	2951	84.50
White, non-Hispanic	49697	94.90
Students with Disabilities	8955	67.20
Limited English Proficient	1378	67.80
Economically Disadvantaged	36362	87.50
Migrant	72	70.80
Male	36923	91.30
Female	35002	92.80

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	71903	91.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	135	94.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	989	95.70
Black, non-Hispanic	18055	85.90
Hispanic	2837	81.80
White, non-Hispanic	49689	94.60
Students with Disabilities	8955	74.10
Limited English Proficient	1217	60.00
Economically Disadvantaged	36236	87.30
Migrant	69	53.60
Male	36837	89.90
Female	34928	94.10

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	72406	88.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	184	85.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	1016	97.70
Black, non-Hispanic	18774	80.70
Hispanic	2860	80.30
White, non-Hispanic	49362	91.80
Students with Disabilities	8949	54.50
Limited English Proficient	1262	65.20
Economically Disadvantaged	35921	82.50
Migrant	60	70.00
Male	37288	86.40
Female	35013	90.70

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	72264	87.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	183	86.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	1002	93.70
Black, non-Hispanic	18771	78.80
Hispanic	2750	76.10
White, non-Hispanic	49347	91.60
Students with Disabilities	8956	61.30
Limited English Proficient	1123	50.40
Economically Disadvantaged	35802	80.90
Migrant	57	52.60
Male	37223	84.10
Female	34937	91.50

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	73645	87.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	90.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	992	96.10
Black, non-Hispanic	19155	77.30
Hispanic	2850	79.90
White, non-Hispanic	50153	91.90
Students with Disabilities	9102	53.50
Limited English Proficient	1219	60.30
Economically Disadvantaged	35888	80.80
Migrant	73	60.30
Male	37680	86.20
Female	35850	89.30

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	73500	87.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	90.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	975	93.20
Black, non-Hispanic	19137	78.20
Hispanic	2718	77.50
White, non-Hispanic	50174	91.30
Students with Disabilities	9115	60.50
Limited English Proficient	1058	49.60
Economically Disadvantaged	35768	80.50
Migrant	64	51.60
Male	37615	84.00
Female	35772	90.90

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	73712	85.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	85.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	1028	96.00
Black, non-Hispanic	18618	73.60
Hispanic	2511	77.00
White, non-Hispanic	51102	89.40
Students with Disabilities	9241	47.00
Limited English Proficient	1081	59.00
Economically Disadvantaged	34257	76.50
Migrant	67	49.30
Male	37619	82.90
Female	35974	87.30

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	73613	89.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	90.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1005	96.10
Black, non-Hispanic	18622	83.20
Hispanic	2412	81.30
White, non-Hispanic	51123	92.40
Students with Disabilities	9264	64.30
Limited English Proficient	948	58.00
Economically Disadvantaged	34178	83.80
Migrant	63	50.80
Male	37557	86.40
Female	35936	93.20

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	81593	73.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	71.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	981	85.00
Black, non-Hispanic	24993	53.20
Hispanic	2757	71.50
White, non-Hispanic	52034	83.80
Students with Disabilities	11507	41.00
Limited English Proficient	1043	57.40
Economically Disadvantaged	36008	63.60
Migrant	68	77.90
Male	41391	72.50
Female	40049	75.20

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	77362	93.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	237	89.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1168	94.30
Black, non-Hispanic	19397	87.70
Hispanic	2335	87.90
White, non-Hispanic	53700	96.30
Students with Disabilities	9983	71.80
Limited English Proficient	718	71.20
Economically Disadvantaged	30288	89.20
Migrant	40	75.00
Male	39623	91.80
Female	37564	96.00

Comments: Change in enrollment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1699	1414	83.20

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	139	129	92.81

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	910	632	69.50

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	139	129	92.81

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

The Department has initiated three major measures to directly assist the schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. First, the Department has increased the number of Exemplary Educators that work directly with the identified schools to improve student performance and to help the school make adequate yearly progress. This program trains exemplary retired educators to work directly with schools on revising their school improvement plans and implementing those revisions. The Exemplary Educator program is a collaborative program between the Department and the federally funded comprehensive center, Edvantia. Second, the Department has opened nine regional offices across the state that are staffed by consultants from No Child Left Behind, IDEA, and vocational education. The staff members from these offices have been provided on-going training by Edvantia to work directly with schools that are struggling with meeting adequate yearly progress. Finally, the Department is prioritizing resources and targeting those resources to schools identified for improvement. Those resources include school improvement funds under Title I.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Tennessee is providing technical assistance to the 7 districts identified for improvement in a variety of ways. First, many of the districts that are identified as in LEA Improvement are assigned an Exemplary Educator to work at the district level with the district staff on improvement efforts.

Second, Tennessee requires all districts to engage in a comprehensive district improvement planning process that results in their submission of a consolidated application for their NCLB funds. This process is referred to as the Tennessee Comprehensive Systemwide Planning Process (TCSP). All districts have been offered technical assistance on how to complete their TCSPs in light of academic and non-academic data from school year 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. All LEAs submitted their TCSPs for review and approval by the State in May 2006 and will resubmit their revised TCSPs in May 2007 based on 2005-2006 data. LEAs that are identified as in improvement must ensure that they have addressed the additional components required in Title IA of NCLB for LEA improvement.

Third, to assist all districts, but especially districts in improvement, the Department offered a year-long professional development opportunity for district teams to develop and implement family and community engagement policies and strategic plans during school year 2004-2005. As a result of this year-long process, the State sent out NCLB consultants to each LEA to review its district level parent involvement policies for compliance with Title IA of NCLB. In addition, as a part of that on-site monitoring and approval process, the consultant visited Title I schools to review parent involvement policies and plans to ensure compliance with Title IA. All LEAs have fully approved district parental involvement plans. To understand more about this process, please visit the State's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/fedprog/fpparentinvolve.shtml>.

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	93
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	209
How many of these schools were charter schools?	10
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2412
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	59014
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: Section 1- The number has been verified as 93 and the total number of Title I schools in School Improvement for 2005-06 was 112.	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	55
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4714
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	36666
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	173404	164573	94.90
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	11548	11164	96.70
Low-Poverty Schools	16114	15947	98.90
All Elementary Schools	60567	59516	98.30
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	23777	21262	89.40
Low-Poverty Schools	34206	32494	95.00
All Secondary Schools	111378	104062	93.40

Comments: We are not sure why Elementary figures plus Secondary figures do not equal "All Schools" Total. There are issues with "Special Courses", there may be some course codes not assigned to schools, and we have some problems with delineation of elementary and secondary schools. Also, there are now a number of "on-line" courses that may not be assigned to any particular school. We will continue to work to clear this up.

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	55.00
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	35.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	65.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	25.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	81.00	43.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free or Reduced Price Lunch Eligible	
Secondary Schools	69.00	40.00
Poverty Metric Used	Free or Reduced Price Lunch Eligible	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	92.10

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The following timeline reflects the development of our State of Tennessee ESL Curriculum Standards: 04/24/04 TNESOL Pre-conference institute TNDOE overview and call for participants; 06/21-06/25/04 - initial committee work for development of draft standards; 07/05-7/09/04 - finalize draft ELD standards and align to LA Curriculum Standards; 08/11/04 - draft ESL Curriculum Standards email for LEA review; 08/27/04 - State Board of Education first reading of ESL Curriculum Standards; 08/04 - 11/04- public review and input; 11/8/04 High School Task Force for ESL Curriculum alignment and recommendation for transition to regular grade level English course placement;

1/28/05 State Board of Education final reading of ESL Curriculum Standards;

5/17/05 TNESOL Pre-conference Institute TNDOE Training; 5/23 - 5/24/05 Standard Setting Committee Meeting (determine cut scores); 07/18 - 08/04/05 Standards and Assessment Training; 12/05 - Webb Alignment Study

Under Section 3113 of Title III (NCLB) the Tennessee Department of Education submitted a plan to describe how the State will establish standards and objectives for raising the level of English proficiency that are derived from the four recognized domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging state academic

content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1). The Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment(CELLA)is a four-modality language proficiency assessment system designed to meet the English

Language Learning assessment needs. The test design of CELLA consists of three elements: proficiency benchmarks; test blueprints; and item specifications.

The proficiency benchmarks were developed based on the experience and professional judgment of ETS test developers and AccountabilityWorks content and assessment experts. The content review has been analyzed in terms of their alignment to the ELL and ELA (English Language Arts) standards of Tennessee.

Tennessee convened a CELLA Content Standard Setting Committee May 23-24, 2005, in Nashville to determine interim cut scores for determining proficient and advanced for Title I AYP determinations. The alignment of the English language

proficiency standards with the state curriculum helps provide students with skills necessary for success on all State mandated assessments. The new ESL content standards also address the language of mathematics, which is included in state accountability requirements for ELL students. The ESL Curriculum Standards contain grade level English language proficiency standards that specify what English Language Learners should know and be able to do in English. The standards also address the language support necessary to enable the ELL to access the grade level math curriculum. These standards provide a bridge for ELL students to the academic content curriculum. The goal of ESL services is for all ELLs to become proficient in English and achieve to high state standards. English as a Second Language (ESL) curriculum standards were approved January 28, 2005 by the Tennessee Board of Education, and may be found at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/standards/index.php>. In the summer of 2006, cut scores for the CELLA were established using the scientific method of bookmarking.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) is a four-modality English language proficiency assessment that is designed to provide: 1) Evidence of program accountability in accordance with Title III of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which calls for schools and districts to meet state accountability objectives for increasing the English-language proficiency of English Language Learners. 2) Data useful for charting student progress over time and, for newly arrived students, for charting progress over the first year. 3) Information about the language proficiency levels of individual students that can be used in making decisions regarding placement

into, or exit from, ESL or bilingual education programs. 4) Diagnostically useful information about individual student strengths and weaknesses in English (with as much specificity as possible within the limitations of a large-scale standardized test).

Initial development of Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) was funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The test was developed by ETS in collaboration with AccountabilityWorks and a consortium of five states: Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee. The test items included in this assessment are based on the CELLA proficiency benchmarks that, in turn, were aligned to the standards of the five consortium states. The CELLA benchmarks were used as the basis for the development of the ESL curriculum in Tennessee. This allows for alignment of our ELP assessment, our state ESL Curriculum standards, as well as our reading/language arts standards.

In December 2005, an alignment study was completed for the alignment of the ESL Curriculum Standards and the CELLA, the state ELP assessment. A formal, independent study linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics has not been done and is tentatively scheduled for summer 2007. This is an on-going process. The State has changed the testing instrument in the past two years and has only completed the statistical analysis of that change within the last month. We are now working to link the standards for testing, academic content and student academic achievement in the areas of language arts and mathematics.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments
1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u>Yes</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>Yes</u>
2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12; 2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension; 3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards; 4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)
STATE RESPONSE
<p>2.1. The ELL test policy requires that all ELLs participate in all mandated English, math, and science state assessments for participation requirements under NCLB. The first year of enrollment ELLs are allowed to be exempted from AYP determinations for Title I. The ELL Test Policy can be found at http://www.state.tn.us/education/fedprog/doc/fp_TESTPolicy_Spring_06.pdf</p> <p>2.2 The Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) tests reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The fifth domain of comprehension is determined by combining sections of reading and listening with equal weight to each section.</p> <p>2.3 A Webb Alignment study was conducted in December 05.</p> <p>2.4 The CELLA is both valid and reliable, based on field test data. For additional information, the Technical Summary Report is available upon request from the TN Department of Education.</p>

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	14904	71.40
2. Arabic	1051	5.00
3. Kurdish	792	3.80
4. Vietnamese	668	3.20
5. Somali	414	1.90
6. Korean	345	1.70
7. Chinese	266	1.30
8. Lao	241	1.20
9. German	188	0.90
10. Russian	160	0.80

Comments: This data was generated by the State's Educations Information System (EIS). It is a relatively new system for the LEA's input. Accuracy is related to the correct input by the individual LEAs. Total N = 20,874 for this data.

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
10893	9003	6

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

This information is not available at this time.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

1. In summer 2006, final proficiency standards for the CELLA were determined by a scientifically-based bookmarking procedures conducted by Educational Testing Services. The new cuts scores for different levels of proficiency are and grade levels are posted on the Department's website at <http://www.state.tn.us/education/fedprog/fpeslresources.shtml> under the link "CELLA Recommended Cut Scores."

2. For a student to be identified as "proficient," he/she must take the appropriate grade level forms of each subtest (reading, writing, and oral skills) and score "advanced" on at least advanced in reading and one of the other subtests.

3. No other criteria is considered.

Please note: For the original submission of the CSPR for 2004-2005, the State was not able to provide accurate information about the results of the CELLA. This includes the determination of the standard on the CELLA for proficiency levels. Because of this, the State corrected this section of its CSPR in November 2006.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

1. English language proficiency is a developmental process. For the basis of determining curriculum for ELLs, the following descriptors for the ability of each designation are provided:

Beginner: Students at beginner proficiency have virtually no functional ability in listening, speaking, reading, and writing English. Beginners are often new arrivals. Beginner level students may go through a "silent period" as a stage of normal second language acquisition development.

High Beginner: Students at high beginner proficiency are beginning to understand language and use it in a limited capacity. Typically, they memorize words and phrases and can comprehend and utilize language that they have been taught. The curriculum focuses on applying literacy skills to the development of new knowledge. In second language acquisition, social language usually precedes academic language development.

Intermediate: Students at intermediate proficiency are able to understand most oral language pertaining to familiar topics but have difficulty comprehending and using academic vocabulary. Speech and writing are basic and contain frequent errors. Social language ability can be misinterpreted for more advanced ability in academic English. Grade level academic content skills are still in development. The curricular focus is on advancing applications of literacy skills for the development of new knowledge.

High Intermediate: Students at high intermediate proficiency are able to function well in most everyday situations but still require academic language support. They may have difficulty understanding text beyond the literal level. They often make errors in structure and idiomatic language. The curricular focus is on more advanced applications of literacy skills.

Advanced: Students at the advanced level of proficiency can handle most personal, social and academic language. Idioms and structure are frequently still problematic. Complicated literary and academic texts may require use of a dictionary when the language and context are unfamiliar. The ESL curricular focus is based on literacy skills necessary for success in a grade level classroom.

Please note: Language proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing develops at different rates. Therefore, there are frequently different levels of proficiency across the different skills.

2. The different levels of proficiency on the CELLA were determined in Summer 2006. The new cut scores for different levels of proficiency are and grade levels are posted on the Department's website at

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/fedprog/fpeslresources.shtml> under the link "CELLA Recommended Cut Scores."

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

For AMAO purposes, the state defines a cohort for AMAO 1, the progress made in the acquisition of English Language Proficiency, to Limited English Proficient (LEP) students who have been in the language program (English as Second Language) for three or more years/ or have attained "proficient" status prior to three years of being in the ESL program.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? No

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 44.00	# 4527	% 55.90	# 5756	% 30.40	# 3031	% 29.00	# 2898

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

For AMAO 1, progress in making and attaining English language proficiency, the State only held the State, LEAs, and Title III subgrantees accountable for LEP students who have been in the language program (English as Second Language) for three or more years/ or have attained "proficient" status prior to three years of being in the ESL program.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	44.00	5244	55.90
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		4137	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	30.40	2886	29.00
TOTAL		12267	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"?

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	51
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	46
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	30
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	51
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	27
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	22
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	5
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	5
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments: The number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-2008).

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	8750	93.50
4	667	92.60
5	556	93.00
6	355	91.70
7	285	87.40
8	237	93.70
H.S.	170	92.50

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	750	93.50
4	661	91.80
5	565	94.50
6	346	89.00
7	291	89.30
8	227	89.70
H.S.	123	80.90

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	77.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	68.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	84.10
Black, non-Hispanic	64.70
Hispanic	67.40
White, non-Hispanic	82.60
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	74.10
Female	81.80

Comments: Data not available for the blank options.
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	2.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.60
Black, non-Hispanic	4.20
Hispanic	4.70
White, non-Hispanic	2.00
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	3.00
Female	2.10
Comments: Data not available for blank items.	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

The school year is a minimum of 180 instructional days between July 1 and June 30.

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	126	126
LEAs with Subgrants	15	15

Comments: 5 LEAs are special schools.

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	302	687
1	302	712
2	261	695
3	261	695
4	238	612
5	242	621
6	230	545
7	228	550
8	201	524
9	193	382
10	174	311
11	132	209
12	107	205

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	98	2039
Doubled-up	1157	3361
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	<n	147
Hotels/Motels	285	491
Unknown	1323	710

Comments: The state had families impacted by tornadoes during this school year as well as it received quite a few hurricane victims.

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	639
1	652
2	615
3	635
4	569
5	610
6	486
7	492
8	478
9	375
10	309
11	200
12	183

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

402

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

319

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

1520

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	682
English Language Learners (ELL)	368
Gifted and Talented	80
Vocational Education	147

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	14
Expedited evaluations	5
Staff professional development and awareness	13
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	10
Transportation	14
Early childhood programs	8
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	13
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	13
Coordination between schools and agencies	13
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	11
Clothing to meet a school requirement	15
School supplies	15
Referral to other programs and services	14
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	12
Other (optional)	2

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	0
Transportation	4
School records	3
Immunizations or other medical records	3
Other enrollment issues	3

Comments: The other enrollment issues were not specified.

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Accurate and timely id of all homeless students by school staff	1
Lack of available public pre-school programs	2
Lack of parent participation	2

Comments: Other barriers not listed were transient parents (1 subgrantee) and family management (1 subgrantee).

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	330	258
Grade 4	Yes	305	211
Grade 5	Yes	310	243
Grade 6	Yes	253	180
Grade 7	Yes	243	184
Grade 8	Yes	222	167
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	Yes	188	105
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: English II Gateway given beginning in Grade 10.

Mathematics Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	337	254
Grade 4	Yes	304	206
Grade 5	Yes	310	241
Grade 6	Yes	253	192
Grade 7	Yes	243	188
Grade 8	Yes	208	143
Grade 9	Yes	186	111
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments: Algebra I Gateway given beginning in year that course is taken, usually in the grade 9.

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.